

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/924,428	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jacob Cheu	<b>Art Unit</b> 1641	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jacob Cheu. (3) Long Le (SPE).  
 (2) Mr. Peng Chen. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Dames et al. (WO 09924428).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant points out that the "holes" in Dames reference are "penetratable" different from claim 1. Furthermore, applicant points out that using Dames et al. is not a proper motivation to combine with the Tiffany, Chen or Liotta et al. references because Dames reference specifically requires "anode" treatment for increasing cell attachment whereas the instant invention does not have this "anode" feature. Examiner would reconsider the arguments and conduct search of prior arts. If, search results show anticipation/obviousness, the finality of the last Office Action will be removed, and new Office Action will be issued..

*G. J. Lee*  
2/29/05